arXiv:1511.05732v1 [cs.SI] 18 Nov 2015

Estimating the Degree Centrality Ranking of a Node

Akrati Saxena, Vaibhav Malik, S. R. S. Iyengar
{akrati.saxena, vaibhav.malik, sudarshan}@iitrpr.ac.in

Department of Computer Science,
Indian Institute of Technology Ropar, India

Abstract. Complex networks have gained more attention from the last few years. The size of the real world complex networks, such as online social networks, WWW networks, collaboration networks, is exponentially increasing with time. It is not feasible to completely collect, store and process these networks. In the present work, we propose a method to estimate the degree centrality ranking of a node without having complete structure of the graph. The proposed algorithm uses degree of a node and power law exponent of the degree distribution to calculate the ranking. We also study simulation results on Barabasi-Albert model. Simulation results show that the average error in the estimated ranking is approximately 5% of the total number of nodes.

1 Introduction

Properties of a complex network can be categorized at the network level called macro level properties as well as at the node level called micro level properties. Examples of the major macro level properties are- small world phenomenon (six degree separation) [1–3], scale free degree distribution [4, 5], preferential attachment [6], global clustering coefficient [7,8] etc. Except these properties, each node also has some unique characteristics that distinguish it from other nodes, called micro level properties. An example of such properties is the centrality measures. Centrality measures are used to quantify the importance of nodes in the network under different contexts. Different centrality measures have been coined to suit different applications. There are some centrality measures that can be calculated using local information of the node, like degree centrality [9], and semi-local centrality measure [10]. Others use global information of the network like closeness centrality [11], betweenness centrality [12], eigenvector centrality [13], katz centrality [14] and so on.

Real world complex networks are very large and dynamic in nature. So, calculation of different centrality measures based on global structure of the network is very costly. Fast algorithms to update the values of different centrality measures for dynamic graphs have been proposed, such as for closeness centrality [15–17], betweenness centrality [18–21], page rank [22–24].

Except this, network size also increases exponentially with time. It is hard to collect and store the complete data on a single system, and process it. This

motivated researchers to propose complex network algorithms based on the local information. Many approximation and heuristic algorithms have been proposed to get good approximated values for different centrality measures [25–27]. These algorithms use sampling techniques, such as, uniform sampling, random walk, snowball sampling, weighted sampling. SH Lee et al. studied different properties of the network, such as, power law exponent of degree distribution, clustering coefficient, assortativity, average path length, and betweenness centrality using three different sampling techniques [28]. O Goldreich et al. presented an estimator to calculate the average degree using uniform sampling [29]. In real world networks, uniform sampling is not always feasible. This leads to a motivated study towards other sampling methods using random walks [30, 31]. M kurant et al. proposed Induced Edges (IE) technique based on random walk to estimate total number of nodes [32]. S J Hardiman et al. estimated clustering coefficient and total number of nodes using random walk, that is implemented using public interface calls [33]. Similar techniques to calculate total number of nodes in exponentially growing networks are studied by [34, 35]. A Dasgupta et al. calculates average degree of the network by taking $O(logk_{max} \cdot loglogk_{max})$ samples, where k_{max} is an upper bound on the maximum degree of the nodes [36]. All these techniques are storage efficient, as we only collect some data samples and store them.

As we discussed, current literature focuses mainly on approximating values of different centrality measures or network parameters. But in real life applications, most of the time, actual value is not important, *what's important is where you stand*, not with respect to the mean but with respect to others. For example, in entrance examination systems, importance is given to the percentile of a person not the percentage. Percentile is an estimate of the ranking of a candidate. Similarly in social networks, each person would like to estimate her ranking to know how strong she is in the network. This ranking can be based on any centrality measure or network parameter depending on the context. S Fortunato et al. proposed an algorithm to approximate Page Rank value using in-degree of the node [37]. Calculating global parameters using local information of the node is future of the approximation algorithms in complex networks. In this paper, we focus on estimating the degree centrality ranking of a node using local information. A node having more number of neighbors has higher ranking.

One simple way to calculate degree centrality ranking of a node, is to get the degree centrality value of all the nodes, order them, and get ranking of the desired node. Complexity of this process will be $O(nlogn)$, given that we have the entire network in hand. Instead of this, we propose a method to estimate the degree ranking of a node using network parameters without having the complete structure of the graph. In real world networks, degree centrality follows power law distribution. Barabasi and Albert observed this pattern and proposed an evolving model(BA networks) to generate synthetic networks similar to real world networks [4]. This model is based on preferential attachment where, probability of a node getting a new connection is directly proportional to its degree.

The present work estimates degree centrality ranking of a node in BA networks. We use sampling technique to calculate different network parameters, such as, total number of nodes, average degree, and minimum degree of a node. These parameters and power law exponent of the degree distribution is used to estimate ranking of a node. We also study variance for the proposed ranking method. Simulation results are shown on the BA networks and real world networks. It is shown that there is very less error in the estimated ranking. Error is calculated, as the modular difference of the actual and estimated ranking. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work of its kind. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes properties of the BA model followed by the mathematical analysis of the degree centrality ranking. Section 3 contains experimental results, and section 4 concludes the paper along with future directions.

2 Model and Background

In this section, we introduce the method based on BA model to estimate the degree centrality ranking of a node. A graph is represented as $G(V, E)$, where V is a set of nodes and E is a set of edges. n is total number of nodes and m is total number of edges in the network. Minimum, maximum, and average degree of the nodes is represented by k_{min}, k_{max}, and d_{avg} respectively. All these parameters and total number of nodes are calculated using sampling method [36]. Degree centrality of a node u is denoted by $deg(u)$, that represents total number of neighbors of the node. Degree centrality ranking of a node u is defined as, $r(u) = \sum_{\forall v \neq u} X_{vu} + 1$, where X_{vu} is indicator random variable whose value is 1 when $deg(v) > deg(u)$ and 0 otherwise. Next we discuss the preferential attachment and power law degree distribution proposed by BA model.

2.1 BA Model

Barabasi and Albert proposed an evolutionary preferential attachment model for the formation of real world complex networks [4]. This model starts with a seed graph that contains n_0 disconnected nodes. At each time stamp, a new node is added and it is connected with m already existing nodes. The probability $\prod(deg(x))$ of an existing node x to get new connection depends on the degree k_x of node x. It is defined as,

$$\prod(deg(x)) = \frac{deg(x)}{\sum_y deg(y)}$$

So, the nodes having higher degrees acquire more links over time, thereby skewing the distribution towards lower degree. Preferential attachment model gives rise to power law degree distributions, where probability of a node having degree k is $f(k)$, that is defined as,

$$f(k) = ck^{-\gamma} \tag{1}$$

where, γ is the power exponent and for real world networks its range is $2 \leq \gamma \leq 3$. As the network grows, only a few nodes, called hubs, manage to get a large number of links.

2.2 Degree Ranking

In this section, we propose the mathematical method to calculate the degree centrality ranking in complex networks.

Consider graph $G(V, E)$, where $|V|$ is n, in which each node $u \in V$ picks its degree $deg(u)$ from the power law distribution given in equation (2), independent of the degrees of the other nodes, i.e. probability that degree of node u is k, is defined as,

$$P(deg(u) = k) = \int_{k-1/2}^{k+1/2} f(k) \tag{2}$$

where, $f(k)$ is power law function from (1). Here k varies from k_{min} to k_{max}, where k_{min} and k_{max} are minimum and maximum degree of a node. Let us define p as probability of a node having degree greater than k, i.e.

$$p = P(deg(u) > k) = \int_{k+1/2}^{k_{max}+1/2} f(k)dk$$

$$p = P(deg(u) > k) = \int_{k+1/2}^{k_{max}+1/2} ck^{-\gamma}dk$$

To calculate p, first we derive c and γ. By axiom of probability, we know that integrating $f(k)$ from k_{min} to k_{max} will be equal to 1, i.e.

$$\int_{k_{min}-1/2}^{k_{max}+1/2} f(k) = 1$$

After integrating,

$$c\frac{(k_{min}-1/2)^{1-\gamma}+(k_{max}+1/2)^{1-\gamma}}{\gamma-1} = 1$$

$$c = \frac{\gamma-1}{(k_{min}-1/2)^{1-\gamma}+(k_{max}+1/2)^{1-\gamma}}$$

To calculate γ, we will use average degree d_{avg}. Using the estimator proposed by A Dasgupta et al. [36], we can estimate the average degree of a graph. By using average degree of the graph, we will calculate the power law exponent γ of the degree distribution. By definition average degree degree of a graph can be written as,

$$d_{avg} = \int_{k_{min}-1/2}^{k_{max}+1/2} kf(k)$$

$$d_{avg} = \int_{k_{min}}^{k_{max}} kck^{-\gamma}$$

After Integrating,

$$d_{avg} = c\frac{(k_{max}+1/2)^{\gamma-2}-(k_{min}-1/2)^{\gamma-2}}{\gamma-2}$$

Using value of c in the above equation,

$$d_{avg} = \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma-2}\left(\frac{(k_{max}+1/2)^{\gamma-2}-(k_{min}-1/2)^{\gamma-2}}{(k_{max}+1/2)^{\gamma-1}-(k_{min}-1/2)^{\gamma-1}}\right)(k_{max}+1/2)(k_{min}-1/2)$$

$\gamma > 2$ for most of the real world networks and BA model, So as $n \to \infty$,

$$(k_{max}+1/2)^{2-\gamma} \to 0$$

and,

$$(k_{max}+1/2)^{1-\gamma} \to 0$$

Therefore the equation can be written as,

$$d_{avg} = \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma-2}(k_{min}-1/2)$$

$$\text{i.e. } \gamma = 2 + \frac{k_{min}-1/2}{d_{avg}-k_{min}+1/2}$$

Now,

$$p = P(deg(u) > k) = \int_{k+1/2}^{k_{max}+1/2} ck^{-\gamma}dk$$

$$p = c\frac{(k+1/2)^{1-\gamma}+(k_{max}+1/2)^{1-\gamma}}{\gamma-1}$$

using value of c, the equation will be,

$$p = \frac{\gamma-1}{(k_{min}-1/2)^{1-\gamma}+(k_{max}+1/2)^{1-\gamma}}\frac{(k+1/2)^{1-\gamma}+(k_{max}+1/2)^{1-\gamma}}{\gamma-1}$$

$$p \approx \left(\frac{k+1/2}{k_{min}-1/2}\right)^{1-\gamma}$$

In the given network, each node will choose its degree according to the distribution as given by equation (2). Let say a node v has a degree k. So, probability that the rank of this node is α, given that its degree is k, will be, As we know, each node chooses its degree from the distribution given in equation (1).

$$P(r(v) = \alpha \mid deg(v) = k) = \binom{(n-1)}{(\alpha-1)}p^{\alpha-1}(1-p)^{n-\alpha}$$

i.e. rank of node v will be α, when $\alpha - 1$ nodes have their degree to be greater than k. Rank of a node can vary from 1 to n, so we calculate expected value of the ranking of a node with degree k. It can be defined as,

$$E[r(v) \mid deg(v) = k] = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n} \alpha P(r(v) = \alpha \mid d(v) = k)$$

$$= \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n} \alpha\binom{(n-1)}{(\alpha-1)}p^{\alpha-1}(1-p)^{n-\alpha}$$

Solution of the above equation will provide us expected ranking of the node,

$$E[r(v) \mid deg(v) = k] = (n-1)p + 1$$

Now, we calculate the variance of the ranking of a degree k node,

$$Var(r(v) \mid deg(v) = k) = E[r(v)^2 \mid deg(v) = k] - E[r(v) \mid deg(v) = k]^2$$

$$E[r(v)^2 \mid deg(v) = k] = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{n} \alpha^2 P(r(v) = \alpha \mid d(v) = k)$$

On solving it,

$$E[r(v)^2 \mid deg(v) = k] = (n-1)p(1-p) + (n-1)^2p^2 + 2(n-1)p$$

By putting the expected value, variance can be written as,

$$Var(r(v) \mid deg(v) = k) = (n-1)p - (n-1)p^2 - 2$$

Real world complex networks are known to have more nodes having less degree. So, there is high probability to get lower degree. We can see from the variance formula that the nodes, having high value of p, will have high variance in the degree ranking estimation. Similarly nodes having high degree will have less probability, so there will be less variance and expected ranking will be closer to actual ranking of the node.

3 Simulation Results

We create synthetic networks of different sizes using BA model, where, each new coming node makes $m = 10$ connections. To verify the proposed method of degree centrality ranking, we plot the graphs of actual and expected degree ranking for the generated networks. Actual ranking of a node is calculated by sorting all the nodes in the given graph as per their degree and then assign them ranking. Expected ranking is calculated using proposed method. According to the model, highest degree node has ranking 1.

In Fig. 1, actual and expected rankings are plotted using red and blue color dots. Two thick lines drawn above and below the rankings are plotted to show the calculated variance for the proposed method. It can be observed in Fig. 1, that prediction for the higher degree nodes is more accurate than the lower degree nodes. Similarly higher degree nodes has less variance than lower degree nodes. All the expected and actual rankings lie between the proposed range of variance. There is some difference between actual and expected ranking. It occurs because, we integrate to calculate the ranking by assuming that the nodes of all degrees (from k_{min} to k_{max}) are present but it does not happen in the complex networks. There can be missing few degrees in the degree distribution, for example there can not be any node of degree 31 even if there exists nodes of degree 30 and 32.

We also study average difference in the expected ranking and actual ranking of the nodes. This is calculated by taking the modular difference of these two rankings. Table 1 shows average error for different size networks. If we do not consider all nodes having lowest few degrees (around lowest 15 degrees) while calculating the variance, then it is very less. It shows that the proposed method has very less error for the higher degree nodes and their ranking can be predicted with high accuracy.



Fig. 1. Plots of actual and expected ranking. Red and blue color dots show actual and expected ranking of a node, and purple thick lines show variance in the ranking as proposed by our method. All results are plotted on BA networks having a)10000 b)30000 c)50000 d)70000 e)90000 nodes, and each new node makes 10 connections when it joins the network.

Table 1. Error in the Actual and Expected Ranking

Number of Nodes	Average Error	Standard Deviation
10000	530.80	466.67
30000	1613.35	1400.92
50000	2684.37	2355.16
70000	3782.58	3304.09
90000	4860.14	4254.90

4 Conclusion and Future Work

In this work, a method has been proposed to estimate the degree centrality ranking of a node without having complete structure of the network. Network size, minimum, and average degree of the nodes are calculated using sampling technique. These parameters are used to calculate power law exponent of the degree distribution of the network. After getting these parameters, the proposed method can be used to estimate the degree ranking of a node. This work can also be used to compare degree ranking of few nodes without calculating ranking of all nodes.

Real world complex networks, such as, WWW network, online social networks, collaboration networks are highly dynamic and their size increases exponentially with time. It is not feasible to download the complete network and process it. In these dynamic networks, importance of different nodes keep changing with time. It is very costly to apply the exact or approximation algorithm of different centrality measures to calculate the centrality values of all nodes. Even if, ranking is calculated by comparing values of all nodes, it will again be a costly process. Thus, one can see importance of predicting the global ranking of a node using local information. It will be a good future direction to understand the ranking pattern for different centrality measures and provide a method to predict it with high accuracy. In future, one can continue working on the prediction of ranking for other centrality measures using local information.

References

1. Stanley Milgram. The small world problem. *Psychology today*, 2(1):60–67, 1967.
2. Jeffrey Travers and Stanley Milgram. An experimental study of the small world problem. *Sociometry*, pages 425–443, 1969.
3. Mark EJ Newman. Models of the small world. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 101(3-4):819–841, 2000.
4. Albert-László Barabási and Réka Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *science*, 286(5439):509–512, 1999.
5. Guido Caldarelli. Scale-free networks: complex webs in nature and technology. *OUP Catalogue*, 2007.
6. Mark EJ Newman. Clustering and preferential attachment in growing networks. *Physical Review E*, 64(2):025102, 2001.
7. Mark EJ Newman. The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM review*, 45(2):167–256, 2003.

8. Konstantin Klemm and Victor M Eguiluz. Highly clustered scale-free networks. *Physical Review E*, 65(3):036123, 2002.
9. Marvin E Shaw. Some effects of unequal distribution of information upon group performance in various communication nets. *Journal of abnormal and social psychology*, 49(4):547–553, 1954.
10. Duanbing Chen, Linyuan Lü, Ming-Sheng Shang, Yi-Cheng Zhang, and Tao Zhou. Identifying influential nodes in complex networks. *Physica a: Statistical mechanics and its applications*, 391(4):1777–1787, 2012.
11. Gert Sabidussi. The centrality index of a graph. *Psychometrika*, 31(4):581–603, 1966.
12. Linton C Freeman. A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness. *Sociometry*, pages 35–41, 1977.
13. Karen Stephenson and Marvin Zelen. Rethinking centrality: Methods and examples. *Social Networks*, 11(1):1–37, 1989.
14. Leo Katz. A new status index derived from sociometric analysis. *Psychometrika*, 18(1):39–43, 1953.
15. Ahmet Erdem Sariyuce, Kamer Kaya, Erik Saule, and Umit V Catalyurek. Incremental algorithms for network management and analysis based on closeness centrality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1303.0422*, 2013.
16. Chia-Chen Yen, Mi-Yen Yeh, and Ming-Syan Chen. An efficient approach to updating closeness centrality and average path length in dynamic networks. In *Data Mining (ICDM), 2013 IEEE 13th International Conference on*, pages 867–876. IEEE, 2013.
17. Miray Kas, Matthew Wachs, Kathleen M Carley, and L Richard Carley. Incremental algorithm for updating betweenness centrality in dynamically growing networks. In *Proceedings of the 2013 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining*, pages 33–40. ACM, 2013.
18. Oded Green, Robert McColl, David Bader, et al. A fast algorithm for streaming betweenness centrality. In *Privacy, Security, Risk and Trust (PASSAT), 2012 International Conference on and 2012 International Confernece on Social Computing (SocialCom)*, pages 11–20. IEEE, 2012.
19. Min-Joong Lee, Jungmin Lee, Jaimie Yejean Park, Ryan Hyun Choi, and Chin-Wan Chung. Qube: a quick algorithm for updating betweenness centrality. In *Proceedings of the 21st international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 351–360. ACM, 2012.
20. Keshav Goel, Rishi Ranjan Singh, Sudarshan Iyengar, and Sukrit Gupta. A faster algorithm to update betweenness centrality after node alteration. *Internet Mathematics*, (just-accepted):00–00, 2014.
21. Meghana Nasre, Matteo Pontecorvi, and Vijaya Ramachandran. Betweenness centrality–incremental and faster. In *Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science 2014*, pages 577–588. Springer, 2014.
22. Prasanna Desikan, Nishith Pathak, Jaideep Srivastava, and Vipin Kumar. Incremental page rank computation on evolving graphs. In *Special interest tracks and posters of the 14th international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 1094–1095. ACM, 2005.
23. Bahman Bahmani, Ravi Kumar, Mohammad Mahdian, and Eli Upfal. Pagerank on an evolving graph. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 24–32. ACM, 2012.
24. Klaus Berberich, Srikanta Bedathur, Gerhard Weikum, and Michalis Vazirgiannis. Comparing apples and oranges: normalized pagerank for evolving graphs. In

Proceedings of the 16th international conference on World Wide Web, pages 1145–1146. ACM, 2007.
25. David A Bader, Shiva Kintali, Kamesh Madduri, and Milena Mihail. Approximating betweenness centrality. In *Algorithms and Models for the Web-Graph*, pages 124–137. Springer, 2007.
26. David Eppstein and Joseph Wang. Fast approximation of centrality. *J. Graph Algorithms Appl.*, 8:39–45, 2004.
27. Robert Geisberger, Peter Sanders, and Dominik Schultes. Better approximation of betweenness centrality. In *ALENEX*, pages 90–100. SIAM, 2008.
28. Sang Hoon Lee, Pan-Jun Kim, and Hawoong Jeong. Statistical properties of sampled networks. *Physical Review E*, 73(1):016102, 2006.
29. Oded Goldreich and Dana Ron. Approximating average parameters of graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 32(4):473–493, 2008.
30. László Lovász. Random walks on graphs: A survey. *Combinatorics, Paul erdos is eighty*, 2(1):1–46, 1993.
31. Colin Cooper and Alan Frieze. Random walks on random graphs. In *Nano-Net*, pages 95–106. Springer, 2009.
32. Maciej Kurant, Carter T Butts, and Athina Markopoulou. Graph size estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1210.0460*, 2012.
33. Stephen J Hardiman and Liran Katzir. Estimating clustering coefficients and size of social networks via random walk. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 539–550. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, 2013.
34. Liran Katzir, Edo Liberty, and Oren Somekh. Estimating sizes of social networks via biased sampling. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on World wide web*, pages 597–606. ACM, 2011.
35. Colin Cooper, Tomasz Radzik, and Yiannis Siantos. Estimating network parameters using random walks. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 4(1):1–19, 2014.
36. Anirban Dasgupta, Ravi Kumar, and Tamas Sarlos. On estimating the average degree. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on World wide web*, pages 795–806. ACM, 2014.
37. Santo Fortunato, Marian Boguna, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. How to make the top ten: Approximating pagerank from in-degree. *arXiv preprint cs/0511016*, 2005.